



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,736	10/25/2000	Tal Moran	3269-8	2270
29858	7590	12/30/2005	EXAMINER	
BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP 900 THIRD AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022			GURSHMAN, GRIGORY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/696,736	MORAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Grigory Gurshman	2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10, 16, 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome by Applicant's amendment. Accordingly the rejection is withdrawn.
2. With regard to claims 1-10, 16 and 17, Applicant states a number of technical features of the claimed invention that are different from the McNabb et al reference. With respect to the alleged differences, examiner points out that they are not reflected in the Applicant's claims. Further more, all the limitations of the pending claims are met by McNabb as demonstrated by rejections provided in the First Office Action and repeated herein. For example:

McNabb discloses that when a user access a web site it can be configured to request a user to provide a user ID and an authentication response (McNabb: column 15, lines 54-58). This meets the limitation of a "first message including a set of actions." Once the user has been authenticated, subsequent requests can be identified as part of the session and communication to other restricted partitions can be allowed (McNabb: column 15, lines 58-61). This meets the limitation of "a second message including user-requested actions and inputs." McNabb discloses integrating simulation software into the system such that any processing routines may be replicated as required to achieve a desired process throughput. The browser-based administration tool can provide a representation of a user's process interactions and requests. The graphic representation may be frozen such that no other processes may be permitted (McNabb:

column 21, lines 51-62). This meets the limitation of "simulating execution of the set of actions and building a list of allowable actions and user-definable inputs to the allowable actions."

3. Applicant also argues that McNabb only discusses providing a user ID and authentication response but does not teach including set of actions. Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that one of ordinary skill in the art would have equated receiving user ID along with authentication response with allowing a set of user actions permitted for the authenticated user based on the user ID.

4. Applicant is encouraged to amend the claims in order to clearly reflect the differences between the claimed invention and the art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-10, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 6,289,462 B1 to McNabb et al.

7. In regards to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-9 and 16, McNabb discloses that when a user access a web site it can be configured to request a user to provide a user ID and an

authentication response (McNabb: column 15, lines 54-58). This meets the limitation of a "first message including a set of actions." Once the user has been authenticated, subsequent requests can be identified as part of the session and communication to other restricted partitions can be allowed (McNabb: column 15, lines 58-61). This meets the limitation of "a second message including user-requested actions and inputs." McNabb discloses integrating simulation software into the system such that any processing routines may be replicated as required to achieve a desired process throughput. The browser-based administration tool can provide a representation of a user's process interactions and requests. The graphic representation may be frozen such that no other processes may be permitted (McNabb: column 21, lines 51-62). This meets the limitation of "simulating execution of the set of actions and building a list of allowable actions and user-definable inputs to the allowable actions." The graphic model of the system is modified into a linked list form that may be used by the UDE and the security gate to control process activities (McNabb: column 21, lines 62-65). This meets the limitations of "comparing the list of allowable actions and user-definable inputs to the user-requested actions and inputs; and where the list of allowable actions and user-definable inputs includes the user-requested actions and inputs, authorizing execution of the user-requested actions." When a process executes a file, the trusted server interrogates both the process and file prior to execution (McNabb: column 14, lines 56-58).

8. In regards to claim 3, McNabb discloses HTTP daemons and CGI scripts (McNabb: column 20, lines 48-59).
9. In regards to claims 7 and 10, McNabb discloses a cookie which specifies known user information recorded during a prior access by the user. The cookie is checked for validity when network requests are processed (McNabb: column 13, lines 49-55).
10. In regards to claim 17, the security system is a solution for any gateway system.(McNabb: column 22, lines 3-5).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grigory Gurshman whose telephone number is (571)272-3803. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571)272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Grigory Gurshman
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GG

THOMAS R. PEESO
PRIMARY EXAMINER